

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Specification and Abstract

The specification has been reviewed and revised to address the informalities identified on page 2 of the Office Action. Specifically, as requested in the objection, the sentence on page 34, lines 10-12 has been amended for clarification purposes. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

II. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-12 and 19-22 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Further, claims 13-18 have been amended to overcome the objections discussed below, to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

New claim 23 has been added as a method version of claim 13.

It is also noted that claims 13-18 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the

Doctrine of Equivalents.

III. Informalities

Claims 14, 16 and 17 were objected in view of various informalities identified on page 2 of the Office Action. Withdrawal of these objections is respectfully submitted since, as mentioned above, claims 14, 16 and 17 have been amended to resolve the problems identified by the Examiner.

IV. 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failure to recite statutory subject matter. As mentioned above, claim 22 has been cancelled. As a result, this rejection is no longer applicable and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 Rejections

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Philipsson (U.S. 2001/0007815). This rejection is considered moot based on the above-mentioned cancellation of independent claim 5.

Claims 6, 7, 8, 10, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Svensson (U.S. 2003/0120920). Further, claims 1-4, 9, 11, 12 and 15-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Svensson, Kurokawa (U.S. 4,607,289), Philipsson, Yokota et al. (U.S. 6,011,958), Isobe et al. (U.S. 2004/0005893), Lee (U.S. 6,205,048), and Gattey et al. (U.S. 5,553,312). These rejections are believed clearly

inapplicable to independent claims 13 and 23 and claims 14-18 that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Independent claim 13 recites an intermediate device that relays a piece of initial data from a management device (on a wireless network) to a communication device. Further, claim 13 recites that sending and receiving of the piece of initial data are each performed using a carrier that reaches a narrower area than an area reached by a carrier used for wireless communication on the wireless network. Additionally, claim 13 recites that the management device is positioned in a location where neither (i) the carrier used for the receiving of the piece of initial data, nor (ii) the carrier used for the sending of the piece of initial data, is able to reach the communication device. Claim 13 also recites that the communication device is positioned in a location where neither (i) the carrier used for the receiving of the piece of initial data, nor (ii) the carrier used for the sending of the piece of initial data, is able to reach the management device. Claim 13 recites that the receiving unit is adapted to receive the piece of initial data when positioned at a first location, from which the carrier used for the receiving of the piece of initial data reaches the management device. Finally, claim 13 recites that the sending unit is adapted to send the piece of initial data only when positioned at a second location, from which the carrier used for the sending reaches the communication device, the sending of the piece of initial data by the sending unit being performed after moving the intermediate device from the first location to the second location.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Svensson fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features, as now recited in amended claim 13. Specifically, page 15 of the Office Action acknowledges that

Svensson fails to disclose or suggest that the initial data is received when the intermediate device is positioned at a first location and that the initial data is sent when the intermediate device is positioned at a second location, as now recited in claim 13.

In other words, the Office Action acknowledges that Svensson fails to disclose or suggest the positional relationship between the management device, the intermediate device and the communication device, as described in claim 13. In light of the above, this rejection relies on Gattey for teaching the above-mentioned features which are admittedly lacking from Svensson.

However, Gattey merely teaches that a communication system includes a central station and a hand-held relay terminal, wherein the hand-held relay terminal is movable and receives a voice signal from headset and transmits the voice signal and a data signal to the central station (see col. 7, lines 11-16), such that the hand-held relay terminal and the headset can be positioned in a location where a carrier used for the hand-held relay terminal to receive the voice signal from the headset can also reach the central station.

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Gattey teaches that the hand-held terminal can be positioned such that the carrier used for receiving the voice signal can also be used to send the voice signal to the central station, but fails to disclose or suggest that:

the management device is positioned in a location where neither (i) the carrier used for the receiving of the piece of initial data, nor (ii) the carrier used for the sending of the piece of initial data, is able to reach the communication device;

the communication device is positioned in a location where neither (i) the carrier used for the receiving of the piece of initial data, nor (ii) the carrier used for the sending of the piece of initial data, is able to reach the management device;

the receiving unit is adapted to receive the piece of initial data when positioned at a first location, from which the carrier used for the receiving reaches the management device; and

the sending unit is adapted to send the piece of initial data when positioned at a second location, from which the carrier used for the sending reaches the communication device, the sending of the piece of initial data by the sending unit being performed after moving the intermediate device from the first location to the second location, as required by claim 13.

In other words, Gattey teaches that the carrier used for receiving and transmitting voice data can reach both the headset and the central station from the hand-held relay terminal, but still fails to disclose or suggest the positional relationship between the receiving unit, the sending unit, the management device, and the communication device, such that the carrier is not able to reach the communication device and the management device unless the sending/receiving units are moved between two locations, as required by claim 13.

Additionally, for the same reasons, it is apparent that Gattey fails to disclose or suggest that the intermediate device is moved between the first location and the second location, wherein communication using the carrier that has a narrower communication range is impossible.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 13 and claims 14-18 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Svensson and Gattey.

Furthermore, it is noted that the above-described structure required by claim 13 allows a high level of security to be realized by using a carrier that has a narrow communication range

(i.e., the carrier used for the sending and the receiving in the intermediate device) for sending and receiving the initial data, although the management device and the communication device are located in positions directly unreachable by a carrier that has a narrow communication range, but are reachable by a carrier used for the wireless network.

For example, assume that a wireless network is attempted to be set up in a house by providing a home appliance that is not easily movable (e.g., a refrigerator) with a function as the management device, while another home appliance that is not easily movable (e.g., air-conditioner) has already been installed in a position such that the another home appliance cannot communicate with the management device using a carrier that has a narrow communication range. The intermediate device, as recited in claim 13 makes it possible to easily register the already-installed home appliance (e.g., refrigerator) when the other home appliance (e.g., air-conditioner) cannot be moved, without impairing a high security level.

In light of the discussion above, the combination of Svensson and Gattey does not provide the above-mentioned benefits of the features recited by claim 13, because the combination of Svensson and Gattey merely teach that the carrier is capable of reaching the headset, the hand-held relay, and the central station at all times (i.e., without moving locations).

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Svensson and Gattey or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Svensson and/or Gattey to obtain the invention of independent claim 13. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 13 and claims 14-18 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding dependent claims 14-18, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Svensson in view of various combinations of Kurokawa, Philipsson, Yokota, Isobe and Lee (secondary references), it is respectfully submitted that these secondary references do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 13 which are lacking from the Svensson and Gattey references. Therefore, no obvious combination of Svensson and/or Gattey with any of the secondary references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 13 and the claims that depend therefrom.

Amended independent claim 23 is directed to a method, and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 13. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 23 is allowable over any combination of Svensson, Gattey, Kurokawa, Philipsson, Yokota, Isobe and/or Lee.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Masaaki MORIOKA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2009.02.17 16:39:08 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
February 17, 2009